

111. e 18 (6)
2

A N
A N S W E R,
T O T H E
A P P E N D I X

Of a PAMPHLET, entitled
R E F L E X I O N S upon N A T U R A -
L I Z A T I O N, C O R P O R A T I O N S
and C O M P A N I E S, &c.

Relating to the
L E V A N T T R A D E and T U R K E Y
C O M P A N Y,

As this S U B J E C T is occasionally mentioned
in H A N W A Y S T R A V E L S.

By the A U T H O R of those T R A V E L S.

L O N D O N:

Printed for R. DODSLEY in PALL-MALL; A. MILLAR
in the STRAND; J. WAUGH in LOMBARD-STREET;
M. COOPER in PATER-NOSTER-ROW; and W. COOK
at the ROYAL-EXCHANGE. MDCCCLIII.



TO THE
Country Gentleman,
AUTHOR of the APPENDIX.

S I R,

ONE of my friends hath lately put into my hands your pamphlet, the appendix of which I understand as a kind of challenge: As I apprehend no great mischief will result, for once I accept it. Self-defence is one of the first principles in nature, but if to this we add the protection of *truth*, and the *love* we ought to bear our *country*, the motive receives a sanction beyond the reach of censure.

All authors have a certain tenderness for the issue of their own brain, and are tenacious in preserving the reputa-

tion of those labors from whence they fondly hope to derive a kind of temporal existence after death. But this motive alone might not have induced me to appear in defence of that part of my book which you attack, if I had not found a certain patriot-warmth in your tract, which I think deserves *respect*, though it stands in *great* need of *correction*. I imagine also that I have *some* knowledge of the person to whom I am writing; and as his trade and profession entitle him to regard, so his pamphlet will probably do some good, or evil, according as his doctrine is interpreted.

I really thought that the nature of the book I have published, and the manner in which I have treated the several subjects contained in it, would screen me from "the arrow that flyeth by night," as well as more fair attacks; but since I am not entirely happy in this instance, I submit to the common fate of authors. It is my consolation that there
is

is not a single line *intended* to deceive ; on the contrary, I mean to do service, to the cause of virtue ; to the interest of mankind, and in particular, I endeavour to promote the welfare of my own country.

Under these circumstances, ought I with indifference, to read your last paragraph without feeling for my own credit, and not less for the cause I espouse ? I have not yet had any experience of this kind to blunt the edge of my sensibility. In summing up your remarks on what I have observed in relation to the Turkey-Company ; you say, “ Upon the
 “ whole, the train of reasoning of
 “ this gentleman, is such a monstrous
 “ string of blunders, that it lays
 “ a foundation for surmising this ac-
 “ count was calculated purely to serve
 “ a sinister turn at this juncture ; and
 “ that this gentleman, instead of be-
 “ ing

“ ing an impartial historian, hath
 “ condescended to become the *tool*
 “ of a mercantile faction, who are,
 “ and have long been in a conspi-
 “ racy to ruin the trade of their
 “ country for their own private emo-
 “ lument.”

Do *you* Sir then *surmise* that I am
 the *tool* of a faction, and engaged in a
 conspiracy to ruin the trade of my
 country ? or that there is really such a
 conspiracy ? If you do ; it is a very
 severe *surmise* indeed ! and if you do
 not ; “ you are throwing about fire-
 brands in jest,” without reflecting that
 you may do as much mischief as if you
 was in earnest.

I can hardly conceive that a man of
 your understanding, whatever his wrath
 may be against trading-companies, can
 have any designs against me, who am of
 no company except that of *Russia*, which I
 hope

hope you will allow is a very *harmless* body. But you stand up against me “ purely for the sake of *truth*, and the “ *good* of your country.” I also love *truth*, and have the *good* of my country at heart; was my own honor therefore in no degree concerned, I might for those very reasons now think myself warranted to make a reply to your Appendix.

First then I am to inform you, that when I wrote what I have said concerning the *Turkey* trade, not the least request was made to me by any person [breathing; nor had I the least intimation, that the subject would come before the parliament. I can with equal veracity assert that I had no conference with ‘any Turkey - Merchant; and what is still more, I had not, at that time, the least acquaintance with any person whom I knew to be a trader to the Levant; What temptation then

then could I have to serve a “finifter turn,” or “condescend to become a tool.”

I think you do me some honor, in using the word “condescend.” What you surmise I should have thought a condescension indeed! It would give me pleasure to be an *instrument* in promoting the welfare of any community, whose *private advantages* do not clash with the *public good*; or to lend any assistance in rectifying errors in commercial oeconomy; but, I hope there are no passions lurking in my breast disposed to betray me. I have not yet discovered any joys in life, which I esteem worth the sacrifice of my conscience.

As to errors in judgement; or errors arising from wrong information; they certainly may happen to a Man without his becoming a *tool*: He may be likewise so unfortunate as to differ with *you* in opinion, and yet be no *tool*. I believe

lieve you mean well, but a fondness for your own system has led you astray. Had you taken the pains to examine the general tenor of what I have occasionally advanced concerning the Levant-Trade, and enquired more into facts, you would have certainly discovered that there is not “ a *monstrous* string of blunders.” The main scope of my design in relation to this trade, was to give an historical account of certain events, as they had some affinity with our unfortunate Caspian-Trade; which originally was opposed to that of the Turkey-Company, or rather a new commerce designed to be built upon the remains of their Trade; at the same time to convey a general idea of our commerce to the Levant, according to the best lights I had received.

In pursuing this point, the only one I had in view, I make that appear which all the world acknowledges, viz. that our Turkey-Trade is decayed, and

C

under

under an urgent necessity of *relief* in some shape or other. It it is true, I deliver it as my opinion, that *such relief* will not be found by throwing the trade *entirely* open, as that to *Portugal* or *Spain*. In this it seems I differ with you ; but do I therefore deserve your *indigested* imputations ? My opinion is founded on my observations in *Persia*, with regard to the supposed similitude of all trades with Mahommedans : Have I reason to change that opinion upon the authorities you quote ? We have now received the concurrent testimony of those who have lived in Turkey, and of others who have traded there for a course of years : Surely there must be *some* foundation for their evidence, and *some* regard due to it. What the Legislature will determine on this point we shall also know very soon. Would it not have been more consistent with your patriotism to have suspended divulging your “ *furmises*,” till such resolution was known ?

The

The words you quote at the conclusion of your Reflexions, &c. do indeed breathe a patriot spirit. "That monopolies are equally dangerous in trade, in politics and religion. A free trade, a free government, and a free liberty of conscience, are the rights and the blessings of mankind." And as you add, "a free parliament inspired with true British spirit, will always think them worthy of regard, restoration and protection." How different are these sentiments from the conclusion of your Appendix! The same high sentiments of liberty which guided your pen in the first case, ought to have restrained it in the last. Zeal for the public good can hardly warrant the attacking a private character in a case of such a nature as this before us: I must acknowledge you treat me gently, compared with that company against which the force of your censures are leveled, because you only *surmise* evil of me; but companies are not so vulnerable as

private men who are marked out by name.

That I was impartial, ought, I think, to appear from my introducing the complaints of certain Members of the Turkey-Company against their own Body in the year 1718 (1). Do these complaints reflect such honor on that company as to countenance your surmises? It is true, though I mention this paper in an historical manner, I think it ridiculous to reason upon an incident which happened so many years ago, when it is apparent, to those who understand any thing of the matter, that things have taken a very different turn since that time. This looks like the verification of a vulgar Proverb; " Give a dog a bad name and hang him. " The same Mr. James Lock, a very worthy man, who was then one of the complainants, and the only one living, is now an advocate for

(1) See Vol. I. Page 54.

for the company, that the remains of it might not be lost by the pursuit of measures which seemed by no means productive of the good proposed (1). *He* may indeed be suspected of partiality as having an interest, but that is not *my* case. I have now the pleasure to know this Gentleman, but my acquaintance is hardly a month old.

In the course of my reflexions on this subject, as mentioned in my travels ; it ought to be noted, that I do not pretend to reduce it to a regular argument ; or to make any such deductions as you are pleased to make for me. Had I suspected that the matter would have been brought before the *parliament*, it is probable I should have taken greater pains to make myself a master of the subject ; and yet upon the revival of what I have
written

(1) You will please to understand that I allude to the freedom proposed without limitation.

written, I do not find any cause to vary my sentiments.

You will find (1), that I give it as my opinion, the Jews ought to be let into the Turkey-Trade. In this I presume I am so lucky as to agree with you; but I would not have the Jews in Turkey admitted as factors, which you may discover (2), though I do not expressly declare my opinion.

What I have mentioned concerning the French capitulating with the Turks, that they should not be obliged to employ Jews as brokers, corresponds with your authority page 83; thus it follows, that the French thought it dangerous to employ Jews in Turkey, even as brokers. We, I presume, make use of them in that capacity, and probably to advantage; but would you have us employ them as factors also? Indeed Sir, I am afraid your zeal
for

(1) Vol. II. Page 63.

(2) Vol. II. Page 64,

for the cause you espouse has carried you a little too far. Would you have us lose all the advantages of factorage, because they might accept a smaller commission for their labor? Ought we to renounce all our influence as the subjects of a great prince; and all our weight arising from our credit as merchants of honor and reputation? Would you have us throw ourselves entirely into the hands of *any* people whatsoever, to make a property of us at their own pleasure; but above all, to give up our birth-right and immunities to a set of men under the circumstances of the Turkish Jews? I cannot say I have any conception of the propriety of such a step. Is this the *cant* of a Turkey merchant? It is really my opinion who am no Turkey merchant. These are the evils which I think there is reason to apprehend, were we from a notion of the utility of an unrestrained freedom to mix ourselves

selves in Turkey with the Jews. At the same time, would the Hebrews of Great-Britain derive any advantages from hence that could be an equivalent in a national light, should they prefer *Jew* factors (on whom they have no tie by native connexions here, and on whose precarious integrity only they must depend) to our own people who are under such different circumstances?

If the decision of this matter rests upon the resolution which will be taken by the Legislature; and if my opinion, at a time when the cry was against the Turkey Company, quadrates with such resolution, you will not be so uncharitable as to surmise, that I am a *tool* to men with whom I have no connexion.

I grant Sir, and it is in your favour, that the incident is a little singular, that my papers should be published so near the time before this business was brought

brought into the house of commons ; but it rather ought to be presumed that I did meddle with the subject, because I thought it worthy of further parliamentary enquiry, than that I had any information of a design to bring it into the house. If this circumstance has “ afforded grounds for your surmises ; ” those surmises thus publicly declared may also bias the opinion of others : Thus you may do me an injury, not only with regard to the esteem in which I am ambitious of being with men of understanding and integrity, whatever their notions may be ; but likewise occasion some readers of your pamphlet, who are not of the *same* way of thinking with yourself, to fall into the *same* mistake, as to the motives of my conduct in this affair.

It is indeed probable, that the more traders we have to Turkey, if they are really traders (1), the greater quantity

D

of

(1) I do not mean to play on the words mere merchants,
but

of goods we may send to that market ; and to all human appearance the greater national benefit will arise. This I hope will be proved by experience. Still there must be a discipline, an oeconomy ; or to repeat my own words of which I am not ashamed, “ a regularity of conduct observed, different from what is practised in our European trade among Christians.”

Concerning the Dutch (1) having traded with ships of three hundred tun burthen ; I think it is granted by implication in what you quote yourself in your note page 45. I will be ingenuous to confess that I had some *leanings*, if not to general ships, which were confessedly under too great restrictions in the Turkey-Trade, yet to such vessels as are respectable, and worthy of being trusted with valuable cargoes.

but men who are able and willing to trade ; and design in consequence of their solicitations, to begin in good earnest.

(1) Travels, Vol. II. Page 61.

goes. This method, it may be hoped, will in fact be pursued as a natural consequence of the value of such cargoes. In the Portugal and Italian Trades, such a rule is generally observed without the interposition of *any* company. The reason is plain, because in both these trades, the cargoes out and home, are oftentimes very valuable, and consequently, it is a prudent national policy to encourage such an oeconomy. It is beneficial to the trading interest, because it may prevent losses to the injury of the manufacturers at home, as well as of the insurers. However, with regard to the trade in question, we leave this matter to its natural course.

But you must confess that the inference you draw (1), is not altogether "natural," since you apply my remark to the present bill (2) at large, as if I imagined the bill to be prejudicial, before

D 2

I had

(1) Appendix, Page 4.

(2) Bill depending in the parliament.

I had any thoughts of *such a bill*, and notwithstanding I acknowledge in the same page (3), that “the sickly condition
“ of our Turkey-Trade demands a
“ more salutary regimen.” Besides, this circumstance concerning the Dutch, with several others of the like nature, are mentioned in a great measure as historical facts ; and you are left to make what reflexions you please ; with condition however, that you do not advance such *wild conceits* as that of my being concerned in any “conspiracy
“ against the trade of my country.”

Can any dispassionate reader peruse what I have written (4) without observing, that I mean to shew that the Turkey-Trade is an object worthy of great national attention ; and the more, as *France* has made so rapid a progress in her manufactures during this century. Are these facts? and are they

(3) Travels, Vol. I. Page 61.

(4) Travels, Vol. II. Page 54 to the end of 57.

they interesting? I am surprised that a man of your penetration, should not discover the main scope of my design ; or discovering it, that you should throw out *such* reflexions, because I happen to differ with you as to the *entire* opening this trade.

As to the "*inconsistencies* and monstrous string of blunders," of which you accuse me, it had certainly been more *consistent* if you had *heard* me first, and *condemned* me afterwards ; if the "cause of truth," and the interest of our country, had rendered it *necessary* to *condemn* me. But the misfortune is, we are apt to take that for the result of reason and argument which is only the effect of some favorite passion.

What I have mentioned in page 50, perhaps you will not find upon examination, so inconsistent as you at first imagined. After the conclusion of the *confederate* war, if the *French* crowded
the

the Turkey markets with their manufactures, than which nothing is more reasonable to believe; is it so strange a thing that a merchant should overtrade himself, and by overtrading himself, should be ruined? Or that a number of merchants should be in the same circumstances? What regulations they were under at that time I know not, perhaps they were unrestrained; but I draw no conclusion from hence; neither do I know if their cloth at that time was in such repute among the Turks as you take for granted. This however is certain, that when a merchant is tempted by the cheapness of a commodity, to buy large quantities upon credit, and send them to a foreign market; if that market does not take them off in time to answer the demands made on him for payment; give me leave to inform you, Sir, that such merchant *may* be ruined. I do not infer that the general interest of a country would by that means be ruined also; for I am sure I never thought

thought of such an inference; but this I will venture to say, that it may be obstructed. I do presume that the merchants of Marseilles were not, at that time, in circumstances to bear a tedious disburse; and their credit failing, is it wonderful that their trade should in a certain degree fail also? Might not this be a favorable juncture for us to slip into the trade, or to recover what we before enjoyed, since nothing is more common in trade than for a scarcity to succeed a glut? We might from the year 1712, to 1718, enjoy great advantages from the Turkey-Trade; I do not say that these advantages arose from the *total* exclusion of the French: You construe my meaning in so limited a sense, as to confound yourself; on the contrary, during that interval, and particularly in the three subsequent years, viz. to 1720, when the plague broke out at Marseilles, the French merchants might, notwithstanding our occasional progress, not only revive their former trade, but greatly

ly improve it, so as to export the quantities of goods which I have mentioned in page 50 (1). The same reason will hold, in the nature of the thing, why their manufacturies should make so rapid a progress, that by the year 1740, they manufactured 80,000 cloths annually: I do not say, nor imagine, that they exported all this quantity to Turkey. If it is *not* true, that they manufactured so much, I am misinformed: If it *is* true, as I am afraid is the case, the consequence I meant to draw, was to *rouse* the attention of this nation. The nature of the case, and not my book, has really roused us, and I hope to a good purpose.

But you still make forced inferences which I had no thought of, as if your favorite point was to sum up the whole, with that extraordinary paragraph at the close of your appendix, than which a man of your *politeness* could hardly have said

(1) £. 240,000 in cloth.

said any thing more out of character : But I forgive you, Sir; your zeal for the interest of our *common parent* with a fondness for your *own opinion*, and not any dislike to me, has betrayed you into this error. I wish you had committed no other mistake in your book.

As you have thus provoked me to appear in print, contrary to my expectation, we ought both of us to endeavor to draw some *good* from it, with regard to the subject of our contest, as well as in a moral sense; and as I do now suppose that we are *friends again*, I will tell you more of my opinion. Make what use of it you please; I am persuaded you desire to promote the common interest.

As to the argument of your pamphlet in general, I am by no means qualified to enter the *list* with you, nor shall I make many remarks upon it. I wish your fire and energy had been

E better

better tempered; and that your historical knowledge with your several curious anecdotes, were introduced in a more gentle and perswasive manner. If what we advance has the appearance of moderation, whether truths or falsehoods, errors of the head, or even of the heart, it does not create that indignation and contempt, which acrimonious expressions are apt to produce. I am far from imputing errors of the heart to you, in the sense you challenge me; and I think some degree of *enthusiastic warmth* is more than pardonable: Yet it is pity men of abilities should be hurried down the *torrent* of prejudices, and by leveling many necessary distinctions, confound the past and present times (1).

In cases of enquiry concerning commercial affairs, it is certainly proper upon many accounts, to join *country-gentlemen* with merchants; but when the former by the force of speculative knowledge

(1) See your pages from 55 to 59.

ledge only, attempt to give laws, how easily are men of the brightest parts betrayed into errors! Indeed I think *you* have overshot the mark with regard to the Turkey-Company; and by saying *too much* against that body of traders, you enervate in some measure the *force* of your *general argument* as to the freedom of commerce, which I think is valuable.

As you have the interest of your country at heart, upon another occasion pray write with more deference to experimental knowledge, which ever will be respectable. All arguments are subject to change their face, as the face of things changes with time; consequently, when strong inferences are drawn from books, we are subject to great delusions. For instance, what you quote in page 34, from Sir Josiah Child, concerning the Dutch having forty times the trade to Russia as we had. If this is understood as imputable to our

E 2

Russia

Russia trade being in the hands of a company, granting that the authority derived from the charter of this company *was* formerly extended much farther than it *is* or can be at present, yet you may thus easily deceive yourself and others by your quotation. The Dutch-trade is indeed entirely free and unrestrained by any company: Yet our trade has throve prodigiously in the hands of the Russia-Company, whilst that of the United-Provinces is extremely decayed. I can venture to affirm that our trade is now above three times (1) greater than theirs. Such are the changes to which commerce is subject! From hence we may presume that some trades *may* perish in the hands of private men, and prosper under a company; or at least you must allow, that a company *may* be so modelled as to become serviceable to a nation. Do not imagine upon the whole, that I am a professed advocate for companies without

(1) In St. Petersburg this is the case; if not in other Russian ports.

out distinction ; but only that as some few branches of our commerce, particularly our oriental trade⁽¹⁾, are in fact carried on by companies, those branches being so apparently under peculiar circumstances, we should proceed with great caution, and not make any violent changes in them at once.

To confine myself to what concerns the Turkey-Company ; I must observe, that as all extremes are dangerous ; I should think it inconsistent with the wisdom of a British-Legislature to make greater changes for the present, than what *are said* to be made ; except in one instance, which I shall mention presently.

The entire opening the trade to Turkey, notwithstanding your high notions of Turkish justice and civil polity, I do apprehend, and indeed I am *persuaded* would make the remedy worse than the

(1) Under this denomination I include the Turkey-Trade.

disease; therefore it gives me great pleasure to see the parliament proceed with caution. I need not tell *you* that the motion of commerce even with European Christians, depends upon many secret wheels as well as those which are more apparent; ought it not then to be feared, that great alterations in its course *may* be attended with unforeseen inconveniencies? The experience of two or three years will teach us what farther changes are necessary, in the Turkey trade, better than all the speculative reasoning in the world.

But if enquiries are made wantonly, or to gratify the caprice of one kind of complainants, *may* not such enquiries bring on evils instead of preventing them? I do not mean by this remark, that things ought to be involved in mysterious secrecy; nor kept from the knowledge of the Legislature, in cases where the national interest is wounded, or languishing in decay; neither that it is
war-

warrantable to deceive by false glosses, or prevarication ; or as you observe, “ to blow hot and cold out of the same “ mouth: ” but that complainants should be clear and definitive *what they would be at*, and to mean in all respects as they pretend, when they apply to parliament.

Be this as it may, I wish most sincerely, though I have no other reason for wishing, than from what I *apprehend* to be the good of my country ; that the heavy charges on the Turkey-Trade were borne by the *state*. When this trade was first established, there might be many good reasons why the Turkey-Company was charged with the support of the ambassador at the *Porte*, together with their consuls, &c. the same reason might exist for a course of years ; but things have now taken a very different turn. It is proved to a demonstration that our Levant-Trade hath declined : It has indeed languish-
ed

ed to that degree, that our Turkey-merchants, who some years since figured at the top of the commercial world, now bow their diminished heads. Yet is not the trade entirely sunk; on the contrary it is said, that from *Aleppo* we annually import six hundred bales of raw-filk. This alone is a very great national object, for if these six hundred bales of raw-filk contain one hundred and eighty thousand small pounds (1), and if what I have advanced (2) has any foundation in truth, what a benefit do we not receive by the manufactory of this filk, in the article of labor!

If our merchants gain only so much, as we ought to wish them to gain, by the import of such filk, or by the export of our woollens and other commodities; we need not fear their continuing to pursue the trade: But that their profits are reduced, and in danger still of declining,

(1) A Bale of 25 batmans, or 300 small pounds, produce 180,000 lb.

(2) Vol. II. Page 18.

clining, is as clear to me, as that there is but a very small number of merchants in the Turkey trade.

Can any one imagine, amidst the great opulency of this metropolis, that there wants merchants qualified to engage in, or able to carry on this trade to the utmost extent it will bear? If this is already done, of what do we complain? If it is *not* already done, the principal cause must be, that the present advantages of the trade, are not only very short of what they *have been*; and are *yet* fondly presumed to be; but insufficient to *allure* these merchants into it. What is then to be done to open a *pleasing prospect* to them as well as to merchants of the *out-ports*? In what manner are we to strengthen our commercial interest in Turkey, in opposition to our *powerful* competitors, in the trade of that country, who leave *no art* untryed? If we really gain near so much on the

F

manu-

manufacture of silk as already calculated, what do we not profit also by the manufacture of our wool? These are prevailing reasons to claim the highest national protection! If it is true, that we find it impracticable to make exactly such cloth for the common use of the Turks, as the *French* manufacture; yet if we continue to try *every art*, we may at least produce something very like it, at the same time that we promote the sale of other species of cloth of our *proper* manufacture. If we *can* afford to use the *same* materials as the *French* use, why should we not make exactly the same kind of cloth? If we *cannot* afford them so cheap as the *French*, be it *your business* under the care of your *patron*, to bring the price lower, in which you will do more service to your country than in writing a thousand pamphlets.

Whatever *natural* disadvantage the trade in question is under, the stronger
reason

reason there is to supply that defect by *additional art*; by a more *invigorated industry*; and by *national encouragement*. The last consideration leads us to the point which I confess strikes me most. Are there any reasons why neither the company nor their opponents have yet made a *point* of it? Can any subject pretend to a common share of virtue, and demonstrate the least repugnance in paying his part of a sum of five, six, or seven thousand pounds *per annum*, when more than twenty times that amount reverts into the national stock by labor and manufactory? About the medium of these sums I apprehend is the expence of the Turkey Company in supporting the ambassador and other public officers. If commerce is not only the source of our splendor, but the very basis of our support; by being tenacious in this instance, do we not neglect our interest in the strongest and most direct view? It is very clear that this charge is such an object

in the present state of the trade, that it deters many from going into it. The removal of this impediment might then be an effectual encouragement; whereas, all the remedies hitherto applied, tho' they may probably be *serviceable* in the issue, do not seem adequate to the disease.

If we reflect that the *state* pays our ministers in all other courts; that the *Ottoman* court is now become a scene of political intrigue; and that the motions of the Turks affect the interest of our allies; these appear to be strong reasons why the *state* should bear the charge and not the merchants. We shall scarce ever have a more prudent, a more disinterested ministry than the present: Can the virtues of ministers be more gloriously displayed than by promoting trade in the most effectual manner? No body can doubt that they are sincerely disposed to advance the interest of their country, therefore when due reflexion is
made

made upon the subject, it can hardly be imagined, that the Turkey-trade will be permitted to droop, if any indulgence of this kind can relieve it : And much more seems to depend on this single circumstance than on any thing you complain of.

I have often heard it said in *Lisbon*, of a certain great *Lisbon* merchant, that his annual gain did not exceed five *per cent.* and considering all his bad debts, and other contingencies, this might possibly be the real case. The charge of consulage (1), and contribution on freights (2), did not, I imagine, reach to three quarters *per cent.* on the amount of our trade to that city. No body doubts that this trade is, a great national object : But if instead of three quarters *per cent.* it had been charged with three *per cent.* as I apprehend the Turkey-Trade now is; what might

(1) Consulage nine milreis, Vice-consulage three milreis each ship.

(2) 15 *per cent.* on freights as *per* act of parliament.

might have been the consequence when the gain was but five to the merchant at home? There is the same reason to believe, that as the one *would* have drooped by being thus *loaded*; the other *will* revive if the burthen is *taken off*.

In cases of such importance, great national parcimony, can hardly fail of producing pernicious effects. We have a recent instance of such policy, in the loss of *Madras*, during the late war. The *East-India-Company* have, I think wisely, altered their measures, and I hope will flourish; but the *Turkey* company, which must be considered in a very different light, cannot afford themselves that relief of which they stand in need.

Thank God, things are not *yet* come to an extremity. Neither the skill, nor arts; neither the industry nor advantages of our competitors have *yet* subdued us as merchants. But might not
an

an annual sum of five or six thousand pounds answer a better purpose, at this juncture, than thrice as much hereafter? I ask this question, because I wish well to the Turkey-Trade in a national view; and not that I consult any Turkey-merchant, what answer I am to make to you, or that I have any, the most distant connexion, with that *body*. Whether I mistake the case or not, I hope things are not come to *that pass* as to render *such motives* incredible.

You see Sir, that I do not amuse you with a vague or uninteresting defence only; I have also delivered my thoughts concerning the *public interest*, without any "*private emolument*," except those self-gratifications which arise from useful passions and honest intentions. I believe it is unnecessary to make any further declarations, with regard to my being no-enemy to the trade of my country; nor yet a partial historian. But if I should
yet

yet be so *unhappy* as not to find credit with you, keep it to yourself; make no personal reflexions I beg; rather condescend to require an *eclaircissement* without writing more pamphlets; but if you will write, be at least so good as to subscribe your name as I do mine.

In a presumption that you are a *friend* to your country, I am far from thinking this any prostitution of my pen, on the contrary, though a *little hurt*, I subscribe myself with great truth,

S I R,

Your most



obedient

Servant,

John's Coffee-House
in Cornhill, 5th
of May 1753.

Jonas Hanway.

